

REMARKS

This is a response to the Office Action dated December 31, 2003. Claims 1-30 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 5 and 18 have been amended. A new claim 15 has been added. Individual issues raised by the Examiner will be addressed next in order in which they appear in the Office Action.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

In paragraphs 3-6, the Office Action rejected claim 5 as being indefinite for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for limitations “the client side” and “the server side”. In addition, claims 6-14 and 17 were rejected based on their dependency on the rejected claim 5. Applicants have amended claim 5 to correct the antecedent basis of the problem noted in the Office Action. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to enter these amendments into the record of this application and to withdraw the Section 112 rejections.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In paragraphs 7-8, the Office Action rejected claims 1-3, 5-6, 9, 11, 13-20, 22, 26, 28 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,790,785, issued to Klug et al. (Klug). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection on the grounds that Klug fails to disclose at least the following limitations of the amended independent claims 1 and 18, respectively: “launching the second networked application from within the first networked application, wherein said launching comprises the first network application providing authentication information associated with the user to the second networked application” (claim 1) and “launch the second networked application from within the first networked application, wherein said launching comprises providing authentication information associated with the user to the server-side software associated with the second networked application” (claim 18).

Klug discloses a registration information processing system that substantially automates the user registration process at websites (col. 1, ll. 60-63). The system includes a registration website that serves as a repository of registration information (Klug at col. 1, ll. 65-66). The process of using this registration website is twofold: first, a user supplies the registration website with the registration information to be used in registering at third party websites (Klug at col. 3, ll. 1-5); second, the user requests the registration information from the registration website when registering at the third party website (Klug at col. 3, ll. 31-34). Notably, the registration website serves solely as a repository of registration information, which can be retrieved upon a request from the user; the registration website does not allow

the user to launch applications (i.e., visit third party websites) from within the website as recited by claims 1 and 18.

More specifically, Klug discloses three different uses of the patented registration website. First, when accessing a third party website, a user indicates that registration information may be found at the registration website, so that the third party website can automatically retrieve the authentication information from the registration website (Klug at col. 2, ll. 24-36). Second, the user registration information is stored both on the registration website and locally on the user's system, so that it is automatically provided to the third party website during the authentication process at the third party website (Klug at col. 2, ll. 43-49). Third, the registration website allows user to "mass" register at a plurality of third party websites substantially simultaneously (Klug at col. 1, ll. 50-57).

Neither one of the above-described uses of the registration website of the Klug reference teaches "launching the second networked application from within the first networked application, wherein said launching comprises the first network application providing authentication information associated with the user to the second networked application," as recited in independent claim 1, nor does it teach that "client-side software associated with the first networked application is operable to... lunch the second networked application from within the first networked application, wherein said launching comprises providing authentication information associated with the user to the server-side software associated with the second networked application," as recited in claim 18. Accordingly, claims 1 and 18, as well as all claims dependent thereon, are not anticipated by, and hence patentable over, the Klug reference.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In paragraphs 9-10, claims 4, 10, 12, 21, 27 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Klug. In addition, in paragraph 11, claims 7, 8, 24 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Klug in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,654,796 issued to Slater et al. (Slater) Applicants respectfully submit that all rejected claims are patentable over Klug and the combination of Klug and Slater because these claims depend, and, therefore, incorporate all limitations of, its respective independent claims 1 and 18, which are patentable over Klug in view of the foregoing reasons. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request for obviousness rejection to be withdrawn.

New and Omitted Claims

Applicants wish to bring to the Examiner's attention a discrepancy in the numbering

of claims in the present application. In particular, although this application, as filed, contained only 29 claims, the last listed claim is claim 30. The filing fee value sheet also indicated that there were 30 claims in the application. This error occurred because claim number 15 was inadvertently omitted, leaving claims 1-14 and 16-30. To correct this omission, applicants have added a new claim 15. This claim is substantially similar to claim 30 and therefore is supported in the specification and does not introduce new matter. In addition, no fee is believed to be required for this addition, because the original filing fee covered 30 claims and the application, as filed, contained only 29 claims.

Conclusion

On the basis of the above it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance. A prompt action by the Examiner to this effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments concerning this submission, or any aspect of the application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the phone number listed below.

Date: June 1, 2004

Respectfully submitted,


Ognjan V. Shentov

Reg. No. 38,051

JONES DAY

222 East 41st Street

New York, New York 10017

(212) 326-3939